

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NIKKI POOSHS,

Plaintiff,

No. C 04-1221 PJH

v.

**ORDER RE PRESENTATION
OF MEDICAL EXPENSE DAMAGES**

PHILLIP MORRIS USA, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

On February 15, 2013, the court issued the Second Final Pretrial Order, which instructed the parties that evidence of past medical expenses “will be presented to the jury in accordance with Howell v. Hamilton Meats & Provisions, Inc., 52 Cal. 4th 541 (2011).” With regard to the reasonable value of future medical expenses, the court directed the parties to meet and confer regarding a procedure for presenting the evidence to the jury, and to submit either a stipulation, or two separate proposals. The parties did meet and confer, but were unable to reach any agreement, and thus each side presented a separate proposal, on April 17, 2013.

California’s collateral source rule provides that in determining tort damages, “if an injured party receives some compensation for his injuries from a source wholly independent of the tortfeasor, such payment should not be deducted from the damages which the plaintiff would otherwise collect from the tortfeasor.” Helfend v. Souther Cal. Rapid Transit Dist., 2 Cal. 3d 1, 6 (1970). That is, a plaintiff’s damage award may not be reduced to account for compensation the plaintiff received from sources independent of the tortfeasor as to amounts the plaintiff would otherwise collect from the tortfeasor. Howell, 52 Cal. 4th

1 at 548.

2 Thus, an injured plaintiff whose medical expenses are paid through private insurance
3 may recover as economic damages no more than the amounts paid by the plaintiff or his or
4 her insurer for the medical services received or still owing at the time of trial.” Id. at 566.

5 [W]hen a medical care provider has, by agreement with the plaintiff’s private
6 health care provider, accepted as full payment for the plaintiff’s care an
7 amount less than the provider’s full bill, evidence of that amount is relevant to
8 prove the plaintiff’s damages for past medical expenses and, assuming it
9 satisfies other rules of evidence, is admissible at trial. . . . Where the provider
has, by prior agreement, accepted less than a billed amount as full payment,
evidence of the full billed amount is not itself relevant on the issue of past
medical expenses.

10 Id. at 567. The Howell rule also applies when the medical payments are paid by Medicare
11 (as opposed to private insurance). See Luttrell v. Island Pacific Supermarkets, Inc., 215
12 Cal. App. 4th 196, 205-08 (2013).

13 Accordingly, in this case, while the February 15th order referred to evidence of past
14 medical expenses presented “in accordance with Howell,” the clear intent of the order was
15 that the jury would be presented only with evidence of amounts actually paid (not the total
16 amounts billed). Under Howell, amounts billed are irrelevant to past expenses because
17 they greatly exceed the amounts plaintiff’s medical providers accepted as payment in full.
18 See id., 52 Cal. 4th at 567. Since plaintiff cannot recover the full amounts billed, evidence
19 of those amounts is irrelevant.

20 It was because the court in Howell specifically did not address the relevancy or
21 admissibility of evidence of the full billed amount with regard to future medical expenses
22 (or, for that matter, on non-economic damages), that the parties were ordered to meet and
23 confer with regard to how to handle presentation of evidence of future expenses. However,
24 on April 30, 2013, after the parties had submitted their separate proposals, the California
25 Court of Appeal issued the decision in Corenbaum v. Lampkin, __ Cal. Rptr. 3d __, 2013
26 WL 1801996 (Apr. 30, 2013).

27 In Corenbaum, the court first noted that under Howell, the full amount billed for the
28 plaintiffs’ medical care was not admissible for purposes of determining their damages for

1 past medical expenses, where the medical providers had accepted lesser amounts as full
2 payment pursuant to prior agreements with the insurers. Id., 2013 WL 1801996 at *8-9.

3 The court then addressed the question whether the Howell rule applies to damages
4 for future medical expenses, and held that it does. The plaintiffs argued (as plaintiff does
5 here) that the full amount billed for past medical expenses was relevant to the reasonable
6 value of the medical expenses that the plaintiffs were reasonably certain to require in the
7 future. The court noted that this argument “necessarily assumes that the full amount billed
8 for past medical services is relevant to the value of those past medical services,” an
9 assumption that the court found was negated and precluded by Howell. Id. at *9.

10 Because the full amount billed is, under Howell, not relevant to the value of past
11 medical services, the Court of Appeal reasoned that the full amount billed for past medical
12 services cannot be relevant to the value of future medical services. Id. Thus, the court
13 concluded, evidence of the full amount billed for past medical services cannot support an
14 expert opinion on the reasonable value of future medical services, and, in addition, such
15 evidence is not relevant to the amount of non-economic damages. Id. at *10.

16 Here, the parties’ disagreement centers on whether medical bills themselves are
17 admissible after Howell, which held that a plaintiff is entitled to recover only amounts
18 actually paid. Plaintiff believes that bills remain relevant to past medical expenses, future
19 medical expenses, and non-economic damages. Defendants, on the other hand, contend
20 that the actual bills for medical services (which necessarily can only be for past medical
21 services) are irrelevant and inadmissible.

22 With regard to past medical expenses, the court has already ruled that evidence of
23 past medical expenses will be presented to the jury in accordance with Howell rule, which
24 does not permit the introduction of evidence of total amounts billed when a medical
25 provider has, by agreement with an insurer, accepted as full payment for the plaintiff’s care
26 an amount less than the provider’s full bill. Accordingly, it is the order of the court that the
27 parties shall stipulate to the amounts paid for past medical expenses.

28 With regard to future medical expenses and noneconomic damages, while the court

1 in Howell “express[ed] no opinion” as to the relevance or admissibility of past medical bills,
2 see Howell, 52 Cal. 4th at 567, under Corenbaum, evidence of total amounts billed is not
3 relevant to the value of future medical expenses or to noneconomic damages.

4 As plaintiff has not presented any proposal with regard to the presentation of future
5 medical expenses, other than having plaintiff “introduce the bills directly,” after which her
6 expert, Dr. Horn, “will opine as to the reasonable value” of her future medical costs, it is not
7 clear to the court how plaintiff intends to present evidence of future medical expenses to
8 the jury at all, much less in light of Corenbaum and the court’s ruling herein that past
9 medical bills will not be admitted. Similarly, while plaintiff claims that past medical bills are
10 relevant to noneconomic damages, her proposal fails to address any evidence of
11 noneconomic damages apart from past medical bills, which may not be presented to the
12 jury.

13
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: May 22, 2013



16 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28